Electrification of Bilikere Village.

Q.—21. **Mr. VENKATARAMANE GOWDA** (Hunsur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the villagers of Bilikere are not praying for the supply of electricity since 1929 ;

(*b*) whether any estimate was prepared during the year 1933 ;

(*c*) whether a guarantee for an income of Rs. 597 was asked on 30th March 1933 ;

(*d*) whether the villagers did not furnish the guarantee required ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT (Sir Harold N. Colam).**—

(*a*) They are

(*b*) Yes, including that for Krishnarajanagar and Hunsur.

(*c*) Yes, but the estimated cost of power supply to the place is about Rs. 36,000 and Rs. 3,600 could not be guaranteed by the Village Panchayet.

(*d*) No.

Mr. VENKATARAMANE GOWDA.—Why was the guarantee amount raised to Rs. 3,600 from Rs. 597 fixed in 1933 ?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—Government are not aware how the figure of Rs. 597 was arrived at. But the records before them show that a sum of Rs. 3,600 should be guaranteed.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—The expenditure is estimated at Rs. 36,000 and 10 per cent of it, *viz.*, Rs. 3,600 must be guaranteed.

Mr. VENKATARAMANE GOWDA.—The scheme will be remunerative by electrifying some important villages like Lalnahalli, Dotnahalli, and others. There are also several mills, irrigation pumps and the tobacco barns all of which will go in for power supply.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—We shall get another estimate prepared and see if it can be made more remunerative.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—How was the capital expenditure of Rs. 36,000 arrived at ? From which place was it proposed to take the power line to Bilikere ?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—From Krishnarajanagara.

Game Supervisors.

Q.—25. **Messrs. N. Bhogi MALLIAH** and **H. P. BASAPPA** (Heggaddevankote Taluk) ; **G. MALLANNA** (Mysore Taluk) ; **B. CHANNAPPA** (Krishnarajanagar Taluk) ; **Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMY** (Mysore City Municipality) ; **M. N. MAHANTHADEVARU** (T.-Narsipur Taluk) ; **K. C. SUBBANNA** (Gundlupet Taluk) ; and **M. S. BASAVANNADEVARU** (Yelandur Jahgir).

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of Game Supervisors in the State ;

(*b*) their grade ;

(*c*) their starting pay ;

(*d*) whether it is a graded appointment or not ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda).**—

(*a*) 4.

(*b*) 1 on Rs. 30—2—50.
1 on Rs. 25—3/2—40.
2 on Rs. 20—3/2—35.

(*c*) Rs. 20, 25 and 30.

(*d*) They are graded appointments.

Gomal Land in Nagamangala.

Q.—31. **Yajaman N. Y. VEERABHADRACHARYA** (Minorities).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the extent of gomal land in Nagamangala ;

(*b*) where they are situated ;

(*c*) their survey numbers ;

(*d*) whether it is adequate for the village cattle ?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha B. T. Kesavaiengar).**—

(*a*) 5 acres and 23 guntas.

(*b*) Near Singarasinakere waste weir, Nagamangala.

(*c*) Survey No. 709.

(*d*) The gomal land is not adequate according to the set standard of 30 acres for 100 head of cattle.

Mr. N. Y. VEERABHADRACHARYA.—What may be the total number of cattle in Nagamangala?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—May be about 2,000.

Mr. N. Y. VEERABHADRACHARYA.—At the rate of 30 acres per 100 head of cattle, is not the gomal in Nagamangala quite inadequate?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In places where there are no lands available, it is not possible to provide for gomal.

Mr. N. Y. VEERABHADRACHARYA.—Could not the *banjar* lands near Singarasinakere be given away as gomal? The restoration of the tank has not been taken up so far in spite of the repeated requests of the people of the place.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If they are included in the water-spread area, we do not know for what purposes they would be required in the future. So they cannot be given away for gomal purposes.

Mr. B. SITHARAMIAH.—But if there is no gomal, how could the raiyats maintain their cattle?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If no land is available, what can the Government do? In such cases, the raiyats must set apart a portion of their land for grazing purposes.

Mr. B. SITHARAMIAH.—Is it not possible to issue a circular to all revenue officers that sufficient lands should be first reserved for gomal and only the remaining portions given away for purposes of cultivation?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That aspect is, as far as possible, taken into consideration while giving away lands for cultivation. But preference has to be shown to cultivation needs over those of grazing. Wherever possible, Government have provided gomal lands and where such lands are not available, there are rules providing facilities for grazing in Forest areas.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET.

In reviewing the budget for 1940-41, Mr. B. L. BYANNA said that from all points of view, it might be considered as a flourishing budget. He had numerous occasions in the past to speak on the budget, but this was the first time when he was happy to say a word in praise of it. On a sum of Rs. 18·27 crores invested on productive works, the Government were deriving very nearly a crore of rupees by way of return. After deducting the working expenses and the depreciation charges, they gave a return of 5½ per cent on the capital invested, which ought to be considered quite satisfactory. For Public Improvements, Government had allotted a sum of Rs. 4 lakhs over and above the grants in previous years. Similarly for several other departments also, the grants had been suitably increased.

Referring next to the Education Department, he said that the grants provided for primary and middle school education were inadequate. But as he had tabled some resolutions on those points, he would defer making any remarks in respect of them for the present.

Dealing with the Agricultural Department, he said that the Government had placed the department in charge of a very capable and patriotic officer and this had resulted in an all-round improvement in every branch of work of the department. The officer had been taking very keen interest in the working of the department and helping the raiyats in all possible ways. At the time the present incumbent was appointed, many people had their own doubts and they were feeling that a square man had been put into a round hole. All those doubts had been dispelled and the officer richly deserved to be congratulated on his achievements. The speaker was of opinion that it would be a good fortune of the raiyats if the services of the present Head of the Department were continued in the same department for some more years.

Coming to the question of land revenue, he pointed out that the land revenue demand estimated for the budget year was Rs. 7 lakhs less than what it was in 1929-30, *viz.*, Rs. 126·69 lakhs as against Rs. 133 lakhs in 1929-30. The reason why the revenue had not improved in spite of the fact that Government had spent very nearly